

1 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

2

3 NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

4

5 Re: Notice of Intent to Prepare a Supplemental
6 Environmental Impact Statement to the Final
7 Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement for
Continued Operation of the Los Alamos National
Laboratory

8

9

10

11 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

12

13

14 January 19, 2005

6:00 p.m.

15 Pablo Roybal Elementary School

Pojoaque, New Mexico

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 REPORTED BY: MABEL JIN CHIN, NM CCR #81
23 Bean & Associates, Inc.
24 Professional Court Reporting Service
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

25 (6701R) MC

1 POJOAQUE, NEW MEXICO, JANUARY 19, 2005, 6:00 P.M.

2

3 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Good evening. I think
4 we're going to get started.

5 Welcome. Welcome. Give people a minute to
6 take their seats, if they would like.

7 Thank you for coming tonight. I am Deborah
8 Hall. I am actually a facilitator. I have been asked
9 to come and assist with this meeting, and I want to
10 ask before we go any farther if there is a need for a
11 Spanish interpreter and --

12 Arturo Sandoval, if you would like to --

13 (Mr. Sandoval addressed the audience.
14 in Spanish.)

15 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Okay. So, Arturo, if you
16 identify anyone, let us know, otherwise you are here
17 if anyone needs that translation help.

18 Okay. The meeting today -- I am going to
19 say that the document manager from LANL, Ms. Withers,
20 is going to give about a 15-minute presentation. What
21 we would like to ask you to do is hold your clarifying
22 questions until the end of that 15 minutes. We'll
23 have a time to have you basically clarify anything
24 that you have heard that Elizabeth Withers has shared
25 with you tonight, and then there will be three or

1 four -- several different -- three or four different
2 ways for you to have public comment, and at the end of
3 Elizabeth's talk we will explain those processes, and
4 then I will be there to help you, sort of moving
5 around the room, to locate whichever of those ways is
6 both meaningful and comfortable for you all.

7 So that's the process for tonight. And I
8 think with that, Elizabeth, I will turn the floor to
9 you.

10 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Thank you. I would
11 like to thank everyone for coming tonight. I'll get
12 this mike set up here.

13 Okay. Can everyone hear me? Okay. Great.

14 I would like to thank everybody for coming
15 tonight to the scoping meeting for the Supplemental
16 Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement for the
17 Continued Operation of Los Alamos National
18 Laboratory. And this may surprise you, but that's
19 quite a mouthful, so I will be using some acronyms
20 tonight. I will be using the acronym Supplemental
21 Site-Wide EIS to refer to the document, and also I
22 will be referring to the Los Alamos National
23 Laboratory as LANL, and a few other acronyms as we go
24 through. There are handouts of the slides that I will
25 be presenting on your table -- I'm sorry, on your

1 chairs, and other documents over there on the table.

2 I felt a little bit of information,
3 background information was in order, and so I wanted
4 to go ahead and give you a little bit of history as to
5 how we got here tonight and -- whoops. And maybe I'll
6 just hold this. Okay?

7 In 1999, the Department of Energy issued the
8 Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement and the
9 associated Record of Decision for the continued
10 operations of LANL. That Environmental Impact
11 Statement looked at four different alternatives, and
12 the Record of Decision identified the Expanded
13 Operations Alternative to be implemented at LANL over
14 the next 10-year period.

15 Fast forward five years, and in 2004, we
16 identified our need to comply with our own regulations
17 to go ahead and do a review of the Site-Wide EIS and
18 consider by means of a Supplement Analysis, which is
19 basically a NEPA tool that we use to determine whether
20 or not an EIS remains valid or whether or not the
21 Supplemental EIS is appropriate, or whether or not a
22 new EIS is appropriate.

23 In this case we determined that a
24 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the
25 Site-wide EIS would be the appropriate level of NEPA

1 compliance.

2 I have been asked by a number of people why
3 prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
4 rather than a new impact statement, so I thought I
5 would take a couple of slides to address that issue.
6 Of course, some people colored that question a little
7 bit, but that's the gist of the question I have been
8 asked.

9 Basically, our DOE NEPA regulations require
10 the preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact
11 Statement whenever there are substantial changes to a
12 proposal, or significant new circumstances or
13 information relevant to the environmental concerns.
14 In this case, we took a look and we realized that we
15 had some newly proposed actions out of the next five
16 years that could possibly result in changes to the
17 modified Expanded Operations Alternative. And they
18 are possibly substantial. We won't know until we do
19 the analysis. But we think that they're consistent
20 with the Expanded Operations Alternative.

21 Certainly there are new circumstances and
22 information that we know about the existing LANL
23 environment that we didn't know in 1999. In 2000, we
24 had the Cerro Grande fire, which burned over the
25 Pajarito plateau, about a fourth to a third of LANL

1 was burned over. The total burned was about 47,000
2 acres in the area, and certainly some of our
3 watersheds in the vicinity of LANL were affected by
4 that fire.

5 We also have conducted tree thinning over
6 the last three to four years that was in excess of our
7 original schedule. We had originally planned to take
8 about ten years to do tree thinning at LANL, and we
9 have done that in about three.

10 We are in a drought condition in the
11 Southwest, and we have a lot of vegetation die off
12 directly due to the drought or directly through bark
13 beetle infestation.

14 Also, we know more about the contamination
15 spread both by surface water and groundwater now than
16 we knew in 1999.

17 There have been area population changes,
18 mostly in the Espanola Valley, and also in the Santa
19 Fe vicinities. Los Alamos County has remained fairly
20 static population-wise, but there has been quite a bit
21 of change in the other communities within our region
22 of influence.

23 And pursuant to Public Law 105119 we have
24 made a conveyance and transfer of various tracts of
25 land away from the LANL reserve.

1 LANL has been operating for the past five
2 years well within the environmental impact envelope
3 established by the Expanded Operations Alternative,
4 and that was one of the things that we considered in
5 making this decision about the level of NEPA
6 compliance.

7 We're not at this time considering the
8 implementation of a different level of overall site
9 operations. With the funding cycles being what they
10 are, we barely had several years to implement the
11 Expanded Operations Alternative, so certainly not all
12 the operations are up to that level at this time.

13 And our basic purpose and need for operating
14 LANL hasn't changed over the past five years.

15 So overall, getting all of this information
16 together we came to the conclusion that the
17 preparation of the Supplemental Site-Wise EIS was
18 appropriate at this time.

19 The alternatives identified for analysis in
20 the Site-wide Supplemental EIS are No Action
21 Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative. I'll
22 probably have to find a new name for that as we go
23 along in the process, since that isn't a very
24 descriptive name.

25 The No Action Alternative basically would be

1 the continued implementation of the 1999 Site-Wide EIS
2 Record of Decision at LANL over the next five years,
3 together with other actions that have been selected
4 and Records of Decisions supported by separate NEPA
5 reviews, and those actions that have been the subject
6 of findings of no significant impact and are -- have
7 been categorically excluded.

8 The Proposed Action, on the other hand, is
9 essentially that No Action Alternative plus additional
10 proposed projects and changes to existing activities
11 that could include enhancement or decreases in levels
12 of some facility operations at LANL. The Proposed
13 Action is going to include operational changes at at
14 least two existing facilities that will be new Key
15 Facilities.

16 And this definition of the Key Facility was
17 established in the 1999 Site-Wide EIS. Basically it's
18 those facilities that house operations with the
19 potential to cause significant impact were of concern
20 to the public based on the scoping comments back in
21 1999, or facilities that would be most subject to
22 change due to programmatic decision.

23 The two new Key Facilities are the Nicholas
24 C. Metropolis Center for Modeling and Simulation. It
25 was formerly called Strategic Computing Complex and

1 also the Nonproliferation and International Security
2 Center, NISC facility.

3 The Metropolis Center is currently operating
4 at about a 30 TeraOps platform. Now, before you ask
5 me what TeraOps is, I have to confess I don't remember
6 the exact definition. It's a whole lot of operations
7 in a really quick time.

8 The original NEPA compliance document with
9 the environmental assessment, and it looked at
10 operating up to about a 50 TeraOps platform, now they
11 think in the next ten years that they can possibly go
12 up to 100 TeraOps. Some of the environmental issues
13 related to that kind of an action would be increased
14 water usage to cool the equipment, and also increased
15 electricity use.

16 The NISC facility is a likely candidate for
17 relocating certain lower level security IV operations
18 from a Key Facility, the Technical Area-18 Pajarito
19 site. Most of the TA-18 relocation activities were
20 the subject of the 2002 Environmental Impact
21 Statement, but in that impact statement at that time
22 we didn't know exactly what we wanted to do with the
23 TA-18 facility. It is located in the canyon. In the
24 last two years, though, we have decided more and more
25 that we want to look at considering demolishing that

1 facility. In that case we need to move some of the
2 lower-security operations out of that facility into
3 new homes, and then also consider the waste issues
4 related to the demolition of those buildings and
5 structures.

6 The Technical Area-18 will then drop off our
7 list of Key Facility, and that would be identified in
8 the Supplemental Site-Wide EIS.

9 Some of the other proposed activities that
10 would be included in the Supplemental Site-Wide EIS
11 proposed actions are changes to existing LANL
12 operations, specifically some decreases in work in
13 projects that might come out either because they are
14 no longer needed, they have become obsolete over the
15 last five years and we don't want to pick them up and
16 then carry them through the next five years, or there
17 could be some operations or projects that get dropped
18 from this line-up based on the issues relating to the
19 stand-down operations that have occurred this summer.

20 We also will be considering the movement of
21 various materials at risk around the Laboratory over
22 the next five years. We will be looking at the
23 remediation of major material disposal areas and any
24 other applicable actions that might come out under the
25 Draft State of New Mexico Compliance Order. It's in

1 draft form right now, so we don't know exactly what's
2 going to come out of that document once it gets
3 finalized. I kind of deliberately left this blank so
4 that you will know that whatever comes out we plan to
5 cover with the Site-Wide EIS, if we can.

6 I have a list here on this slide of some
7 newly-proposed construction activities and operation
8 of new facilities. If I can use an analogy, I want
9 you all to think of these as being little bitty,
10 teeny, tiny hard green tomatoes on the vine. They are
11 conceptual projects. We looked at them for the next
12 five years. Some of these are more conceptual than
13 others. Fertilization may have taken place, but the
14 fruit's really not very developed. Any good gardener
15 will tell you that there's a lot of things that can
16 happen before you see a piece of fruit on your plate
17 at the dinner table. The fruit can wither on the vine
18 and fall off.

19 If I had to tell you which one of these
20 projects might fall off, I would pick the first one as
21 being a likely candidate.

22 On the other hand, the fruit can plump up,
23 become juicy, ripe and be a full-blown project. So
24 we'll be looking at these over the next several months
25 to try to figure out which ones of them are going to

1 become full-blown projects, and we will analyze as
2 appropriate in the Supplemental Site-Wide EIS.

3 Just very briefly, with regard to these
4 projects, some of the environmental issues to
5 consider -- the solid waste transfer station proposal
6 might involve a site that's a green field site. We
7 would have to bring in roads, utilities. There could
8 be issues related to various different environmental
9 resource areas.

10 An office and light Laboratory complex is
11 being considered for Two-Mile Mesa. Again, this is
12 very conceptual. And right now they are looking at a
13 green field location. Again, roads, utilities,
14 building on the green field site requires the removal
15 of habitat, perhaps. So those are some of the things
16 to consider.

17 We are also looking at a consolidated
18 warehouse and a truck inspection station to replace
19 existing LANL facilities. Again, a green field area.
20 Although it's near a developed area, the vicinity is
21 in a location that is near the San Ildefonso sacred
22 areas, so there are cultural issues to be seriously
23 considered for that proposal.

24 The new radiography facility at Technical
25 Area-55 is a project that essentially might have

1 beneficial benefits because it eliminates some
2 transportation of radioactive material over the public
3 roads out to the existing facility at Technical
4 Area-8. On the minus side, though, the adverse effect
5 side, as we would be considering the demolition of the
6 existing Technical Area-8 facility, so we would have
7 waste issues to deal with.

8 We're considering the increase to types and
9 quantities of waste sealed sources that we could be
10 accepting in from the public sector, also other
11 federal agencies. Some of these are fairly
12 radioactive, and as of yet there isn't a path forward
13 for their disposal. So those would be managed
14 long-term.

15 The replacement facility for the
16 Radiological Liquid Waste Treatment Facility,
17 primarily one of the major issues and concerns for
18 that project would be a waste pond that they would be
19 using, an evaporation pond. They want to go to zero
20 discharge for that project. It can have beneficial
21 benefits in that it would eliminate waste going into
22 the canyon that's already contaminated, so it would
23 remove a source of contaminant transport. On the
24 other hand, though, that canyon is occupied by a
25 threatened and endangered species, so we have to

1 consider adverse effect to that species.

2 Environmental issues and resource areas to
3 be considered in the Supplemental Site-Wide EIS are
4 the same as the issues in areas considered in the 1999
5 Site-Wide EIS. In the Supplemental Site-Wide EIS we
6 do plan to go back and roll up the last five years of
7 information about LANL operations, and then we'll look
8 out over the next five years of LANL operations.
9 Again, that goes back to the 10-year window identified
10 in the original Site-Wide EIS.

11 The site accident impact analyses is going
12 to be updated. Some of the reasons for that, for
13 example, are the use of a different dose-to-risk
14 conversion factor that we are now using in the
15 Department of Energy from those that were used in the
16 1999 EIS, so we'll be redoing the calculations for the
17 1999 EIS using the new numbers, and then we'll be able
18 to add the calculations from new projects and changes
19 so that those can be prepared and added directly.

20 Also, we want to redo the wildfire-initiated
21 accident scenario. That was one of our accident
22 analyses considered in 1999 Site-Wide EIS, based on
23 the changes that have been occurring at LANL with the
24 fire, the thinning and so forth.

25 There are some wildcards out there in the

1 form of actions that are currently undergoing NEPA
2 compliance reviews. One of these wildcards, as I'll
3 call it, is the operation of the Biosafety Level 3
4 facility at Los Alamos. This is the subject of a
5 environmental assessment under preparation. We hope
6 to have a Draft Environmental Assessment completed
7 soon, and the decision regarding the need to prepare
8 an EIS or issue a finding of no significant impact
9 will likely be made before the Draft Supplemental
10 Site-Wide EIS is scheduled to be issued.

11 Similarly, we are looking at an
12 Environmental Assessment preparation for the
13 Remediation of Material Disposal Areas, an old
14 landfill, county landfill at the Los Alamos Airport.
15 This is one of the land transfer tracts, and it's the
16 subject of, again, of the EA under preparation. And
17 again, we expect to have that analysis finalized in
18 advance of the issuance of the Draft Supplemental
19 Site-Wide EIS.

20 The Construction and Operation of a Modern
21 Pit Facility was the subject of a Draft Supplemental
22 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement about a
23 year ago. That project is on hold and I don't know if
24 the final EIS will be issued over the next year or
25 not. We'll just have to keep checking on that issue.

1 Another Environmental Impact Statement that
2 was just recently initiated with the Consolidation of
3 Nuclear Operations Related to the Production of
4 Radioisotope Power Systems, there was a scoping
5 meeting held in Los Alamos in December and this
6 Environmental Impact Statement isn't scheduled to be
7 issued in draft form until the spring of 2006. To the
8 extent that we can, we'll capture that in our
9 Cumulative Impact Analysis in the Supplemental
10 Site-Wide EIS as well.

11 I do have a management review team of
12 people. I kind of want to put this slide in tonight
13 to jog your memory, if you will. I do operate with a
14 team of folks, I have a DOE people, NNSA people, also
15 LANL subject matter experts and, of course, we have a
16 contractor that's preparing our document. So I do
17 have a lot of input from various different sources
18 that will help me screen the various proposals and
19 changes, and ultimately determine what becomes the
20 subject to be evaluated in the Supplemental Site-Wide
21 EIS.

22 The purpose of this scoping meeting is to
23 engage interested parties early in the analysis
24 process, provide a forum for the NNSA to communicate
25 information, and to solicit comments regarding the

1 scope of the Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement,
2 especially the issues for impact analysis.

3 You may think that we didn't quite hit the
4 mark on the original Site-Wide EIS and you may want to
5 make recommendations for this supplemental Site-Wide
6 EIS. I would appreciate having those kinds of
7 comments.

8 The Supplemental Site-Wide EIS process calls
9 for scoping meetings to be an optional feature. We
10 thought, though, the team, the management review team,
11 that this was important that we engage folks early in
12 the process, and that it was the right thing to do.
13 We thought that the process could only benefit from
14 public scoping, so we wanted to have this meeting
15 tonight.

16 We're going to have informal discussion
17 opportunities. You have noticed tables set up around
18 the room and chairs for your comfort. You have
19 noticed informational charts, I'm sure, as you came
20 into the room. There will be flip charts available
21 for you to record your thoughts and comments. There
22 will be subject matter experts at each of the tables
23 to ask questions of and to address any questions.

24 We want your comments on the scope of this
25 EIS and we have provided various different ways for

1 you to offer your comments. We do have the court
2 reporter available tonight, who after we finish this
3 formal piece of the meeting will be available to take
4 your verbatim comments down so that they become part
5 of the record.

6 I also have a toll-free telephone number set
7 up, and information about that telephone number is
8 available at the table just beyond the court reporter.

9 We will be taking the flip charts and
10 looking for comments on those, and those will become
11 part of the record.

12 We also have forms available if you want to
13 give us written comments on -- on a smaller form.
14 Those can be taken with you and mailed back later.
15 You can mail me, you can fax me. I do have an E-mail
16 address set up which, by the way, wasn't working
17 earlier last week, but it is working now.

18 The potential scope of the Site-Wide
19 Supplemental EIS discussed tonight and identified in
20 our Federal Register Notice of Intent that came out
21 earlier this month in the Federal Register is
22 intensive, and I wanted to make this point because I
23 didn't want anyone to think that things are set in
24 concrete, because they are not. It's just --
25 basically it is to facilitate public comment and

1 thought processes. It is not intended to be
2 all-inclusive, and it's not intended to imply
3 predetermination of potential impacts, either.

4 Like I said, these projects that you will
5 see posters on are conceptual. They can change. We
6 can add more onto the list. Some of them in the
7 coming months may fall off.

8 We want your help in scoping this EIS, and
9 we hope that you will take some time to give some
10 serious thought as to what issues and areas of concern
11 you think we should analyze in this document.

12 We are going to have the scoping period
13 extend through the end of February. A little bit of
14 confusion with the Federal Register Notice, identified
15 February 28th and, oops, I made a mistake. One of the
16 letters said the 28th. The bottom is, the last of
17 February is the end of the scoping period.

18 I want to thank you all for coming tonight
19 to this scoping meeting. Following this meeting,
20 we'll be taking all of the comments received by the
21 end of the month of February. We'll use those, then,
22 to scope the analysis of the impact analysis that we
23 do. We'll be shooting to have a draft of the
24 Supplemental Site-Wide EIS issued for public review
25 and comment in the September time frame. We'll

1 probably have about a 60-day comment period. Our
2 regulations require at least 45 days. 60 days, a
3 couple of months is a possibility. We will then take
4 all the comments we receive during the comment period
5 on the draft document and use those, then, to produce
6 a final document that we expect to have ready, if all
7 goes well, about in the December or January time
8 frame.

9 The earliest, then, we could expect a Record
10 of Decision out of this process is about March, April
11 time frame.

12 And with that I'm going to turn the meeting
13 back over to Deb, and she will facilitate questions.

14 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Hi. Just to let you
15 know, again, remember that there are ways to attach
16 your name to the record, either by via the court
17 reporter, the tables in -- the discussion tables also
18 give you that opportunity through the flip charts.
19 And just know that we'll generally take this
20 particular period clarifying comments of anything that
21 you have questions about that Elizabeth spoke to. So,
22 please --

23 FROM THE FLOOR: Yes.

24 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Would you like to talk
25 into the mike so the court reporter can hear you?

1 FROM THE FLOOR: No problem.

2 Hi. Peggy Prince, Peace Action, New
3 Mexico. And I wanted to find out who we would talk to
4 at one of these tables regarding questions and public
5 concerns over the Biosafety Level 3 lab. And also, I
6 wanted to let you know that I brought over 8,500
7 petition signatures calling for a full Environmental
8 Impact Statement for the BSL-3. Thank you.

9 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: I would like to
10 direct that question, I think, to the NEPA table,
11 since that is an issue that is undergoing current NEPA
12 analysis. So it will be this table over here on the
13 side of the room, and Jeff Robbins is somewhere in the
14 audience, and he will be wearing a name tag.

15 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Thanks. Yes, please?

16 FROM THE FLOOR: I would like to know what
17 in the -- in the Supplemental SWEIS is left out that
18 would be in a full, new SWEIS if you had to do that?

19 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: For instance, at
20 this moment I would have to say it would be different
21 cover pages and titles. We're going to be doing a
22 really thorough analysis. It is a full-blown
23 Environmental Impact Statement, and we'll be looking
24 at everything from nuts to soup and dessert.

25 FROM THE FLOOR: So then why not just do the

1 full SWEIS and make everybody happy? What about that?

2 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Basically our
3 regulations say that we need to call it a Supplemental
4 Environmental Impact Statement.

5 FROM THE FLOOR: Is my understanding
6 correct, though, that in the Supplemental SWEIS the No
7 Action Alternative would actually be the Expanded
8 Operations Alternative that was presented in a full
9 SWEIS, so if we were to get a full SWEIS now, to
10 answer your question, it seems as though the No Action
11 Alternative would be indeed, no action, rather than
12 expanded operation? Is that the case?

13 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: No, that actually
14 isn't. Our original Site-Wide Environmental Impact
15 Statement, which, by the way, we have extra copies of
16 if any of you would like to take one home -- we have a
17 couple of warehouses full. We are running a special
18 tonight.

19 Our No Action was not literally stop all
20 operations at the Laboratory.

21 FROM THE FLOOR: I mean --

22 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: It wouldn't be
23 that. We're not -- we're realistically, we're not
24 considering that alternative. You are right. Our
25 alternative would be slightly different. Our

1 packaging would be slightly different. Our focus may
2 be slightly different, but the basic analysis of
3 impacts would still be there.

4 FROM THE FLOOR: Do you want to ask a
5 follow-up question?

6 FROM THE FLOOR: No.

7 MS. JOANIE AHRENS: Good evening,
8 Elizabeth. I'm Joanie Ahrens with Concerned Citizens
9 for Nuclear Safety. I would like to follow up on
10 Edith's question. With respect to a lot of the
11 nonproliferation work that's being done around the
12 world, that it seems that a No Action Alternative, a
13 real No Action Alternative would be something that
14 would need to be included in the scope of this SWEIS
15 or a new. And we believe that that would move it into
16 a new -- the need for a new Site-Wide Environmental
17 Impact Statement. So I just want to put that in the
18 record. Does that make sense?

19 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Sure.

20 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. So I have a couple
21 of questions. One is, on page 10 you talked about a
22 dose to risk. What is that based on?

23 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: There's an
24 interagency committee that basically reviewed
25 dose-to-risk calculations, and they make

1 recommendations from time to time for agencies to use,
2 and they came out with a new report, a new
3 recommendation about three years ago, and DOE did go
4 ahead and adopt those. They are more conservative
5 than the dose-to-risk calculations we used in 1999.

6 FROM THE FLOOR: And so, is there a -- is
7 that -- is there a link available? Is it a DOE
8 order? Is it something that we can get access to?

9 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: It isn't in our
10 agency organization. It's not DOE. And I believe the
11 answer to that is, yes, but I have to be honest with
12 you, I tried to pull up the information because I
13 thought somebody would ask me that, and unfortunately
14 my computer wasn't wanting to play on the Internet and
15 so I couldn't do so. But there should be an Internet
16 address. So I could get you that information later on
17 the exact identity of that other agency committee's
18 name.

19 FROM THE FLOOR: So, will that be -- is
20 there a website associated with this whole process
21 that people could go to, to look -- to have that
22 reference?

23 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: That's a good idea.
24 I do have a -- we have a brand new LASO -- that's the
25 Los Alamos Site Office -- website, and I could post it

1 up on that website.

2 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. But if you could
3 send that link to me I would appreciate it.

4 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Certainly.

5 FROM THE FLOOR: My second question is, who
6 are the team members on your SWEIS, S-SWEIS -- who are
7 your team members?

8 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: By name, they
9 probably wouldn't mean that much to you. I have got
10 about 15 people. There are four or five lawyers.
11 There are public relations people. There are NEPA
12 specialists. There are subject matter specialists.
13 There are project specialists. There's a big suite of
14 people.

15 FROM THE FLOOR: So could you list some of
16 the key people, please?

17 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Myself is number
18 one.

19 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. Specifically the
20 site, the subject matter specialist?

21 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: At the LASO facility
22 you know probably Mat Johanssen, Steve Fong, Juan
23 Griego, Will Chavez, Lloyd Smith, Eugene Colton.
24 Let's see. I'm missing someone but -- and I
25 apologize -- oh, Woody Woodworth. And I think I'm

1 still missing someone. I apologize.

2 FROM THE FLOOR: And how about other folks?

3 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Well, let's see. We
4 have -- oh, I know who I'm missing. I'm missing
5 Bernie Blue from the LASO office.

6 From the headquarters office we have Andy
7 Kosorski, we have Dean Monroe, I have Carol
8 Borkstrum. I have -- let's see -- I can't think of
9 Bob's last name. I apologize. Sam Johnson. Let's
10 see -- Alice Williams I believe. And -- let's see.
11 There are several more folks that are going to be
12 assisting and be seeing members. I'm sorry. I'm
13 drawing a blank right now.

14 FROM THE FLOOR: How about from LANL?

15 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Oh, goodness
16 gracious.

17 Everybody want to raise your hand from LANL?

18 Those folks there are at least a good start
19 on the list.

20 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. Great.

21 And then I just have one more comment.

22 Another reason that we believe that a site --

23 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Just a second. Are there
24 other clarifying questions? Again, a reminder that
25 for specific opinions and comments, we want you to go

1 to the court reporter, and there will be a process for
2 these experts, to ask of each individual area all the
3 things you want to know about those specifics things,
4 because they are the ones that know. So let me share,
5 and then I'll come back to you if there are other
6 comments.

7 FROM THE FLOOR: It's a question about
8 process. If we want to give an oral comment, we go to
9 the court reporter, which means we don't speak to the
10 whole group here? Just to the court reporter?

11 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Correct. The process.
12 And the opportunity that they have developed is to
13 have you speak directly with the experts in those
14 areas, get your questions answered.

15 FROM THE FLOOR: So if I have a statement, I
16 have to go to that table and that table and that
17 table, instead of just speaking once?

18 MS. DEBORAH HALL: You can speak to the
19 court reporter.

20 FROM THE FLOOR: But then the people here
21 don't hear it; right?

22 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Correct.

23 FROM THE FLOOR: I don't like that. I would
24 like to speak once and be done with it.

25 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Anyone who has not yet

1 spoken would like to -- and we'll make the circle
2 again.

3 Okay. Let me come back here and then we'll
4 come back to you. Please, go ahead.

5 FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you for that
6 opportunity to speak. So I'm going to speak about why
7 we believe that a new SWEIS is needed, and probably
8 the biggest reason is because over 40 percent of LANL
9 -- of Santa Fe's drinking water comes from the Buckman
10 well field, and there's new LANL reports that have
11 been created since 1999 that talk about the drawdown
12 of the Buckman well field and the cones of depression
13 getting larger and larger.

14 Excuse me, I would like to finish. We are
15 very uncomfortable with this format and I did call
16 Elizabeth ahead of time about this format, and it was
17 the same format that we had for the Bioweapons Lab
18 that I complained about vigorously, so I'm going to
19 take two minutes and I'm going to explain this
20 concern.

21 40 percent of the water comes from -- for
22 Santa Fe comes from the Buckman well field. There's
23 new LANL reports that say that the drawdown in the
24 Buckman well field may draw LANL contaminants over to
25 the Buckman well field, and we believe that that is

1 the largest contributing factor to the need for a new
2 SWEIS.

3 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Thank you very much.

4 Just given what I said, thank you for keeping it short
5 and I appreciate that. And again if you want to give
6 a specific name-associated comment, you can also make
7 that to the court reporter.

8 I also want this to be fair in the sense
9 that -- you know, so that comments are made. Are
10 there any other clarifying questions for things about
11 the content, again, knowing that the experts in each
12 of those areas are at the table? And given that I
13 hear that you made comments about not liking this
14 particular format.

15 So, were there other clarifying questions
16 about anything that Elizabeth had to say?

17 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Okay.

18 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: All right.

19 FROM THE FLOOR: I have a question.

20 Great. In this document, it states that one
21 of the wildcards is the operation of the
22 bioweapons-capable facility at LANL, which I addressed
23 a few minutes ago. And I would like to know how far
24 along that facility is, and whether there are going to
25 be significant changes to the operation of the

1 facility giving -- given the rivers of money that are
2 flowing through bioweapons-capable laboratories all
3 over the country right now. I would like to know why
4 you feel you need to have a BSL-3 here at the nation's
5 premier nuclear weapons production and research
6 facility?

7 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Just for the record,
8 that's a Biosafety Level-3 facility that you are
9 referring to. And this facility has been
10 constructed. We did do an environmental assessment a
11 couple of years for the construction and operation of
12 the facility that reached a finding of insignificant
13 impact. The facility is constructed. It has not been
14 operated. And we are in the process of developing a
15 new environmental assessment to address the operation
16 of the facility. That's why it was identified as
17 somewhat of a wildcard with relationship to the
18 Supplemental Site-Wide EIS.

19 I think probably the other questions that
20 you had asked would be better answered in the
21 one-to-one forum, so if you would, please hold those
22 questions until you can speak with the subject matter
23 expert at the table.

24 MS. DEBORAH HALL: So let me just say that I
25 think I heard two things. One is a request for a

1 different format. I heard that from several people.
2 Also, a number of different questions from the
3 different portions of the different facilities, the
4 different tables that we have today. I would really
5 like to -- could one person from each table just state
6 who you are and who you are associated with, so people
7 can see around the room who you are. Just one person
8 from each table say which of these projects we are
9 talking about you speak to?

10 MR. EUGENE COLTON: Yes. Eugene Colton,
11 LASO, table for radiography.

12 MS. DEBORAH HALL: In the back, please?
13 Speak loudly.

14 MR. PAUL SHUMANN: Paul Shumann with Los
15 Alamos Laboratory. We are doing Environmental
16 Restoration.

17 MS. DEBORAH HALL: And here?

18 MR. NICHOLAS NAGY: Nicholas Nagy, Los
19 Alamos National Laboratory, the Metropolis Center.

20 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Okay. And here, please?

21 MS. NANCY JO NICHOLAS: Nancy Jo Nicholas,
22 Los Alamos National Laboratory, Technical Area-18 and
23 Nonproliferation and International Security Center,
24 NISC.

25 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Thank you. Here?

1 MR. SAM LOCKLIN: Sam Locklin, Los Alamos
2 National Laboratory, Environmental Changes.

3 MR. KENNETH RAY: Kenneth Ray, Los Alamos
4 National Laboratory, Land Conveyance Transfer.

5 MR. IVAN TRUJILLO: Ivan Trujillo, NNSA,
6 Radioactive Waste Treatment Facility Project.

7 MS. DEBORAH HALL: And Jeff is in the back.
8 Jeff belongs at that NEPA table, and I think one of
9 you had a specific question that was referred to the
10 NEPA table, so Jeff will be there.

11 So those are your tables. There is a place
12 there to both speak and get your questions answered
13 from the experts, to write on those flip charts as you
14 would what you want recorded into those six different
15 areas. The court reporter is here. Beth Hale has the
16 sign-up list. They would like to be able to allow you
17 five minutes with the court reporter. And it just
18 depends on how many people sign up.

19 Just so you know, the meeting is scheduled
20 to end at 8:00, and we will get kicked out by the
21 school not too long after that when they pack up the
22 chairs and the janitors come in to lock up. We hope
23 that you will have time to be able to make your
24 comments in that forum.

25 And I think that the third way, again, just

1 to remember, that the flip charts, the conversations
2 with these folks and the flip chart writing will get
3 incorporated into that record.

4 The documents are on the table, and I'm
5 sorry --

6 MS. BETH HALE: Written comment forms.

7 MS. DEBORAH HALL: And there are written
8 comment forms on all the tables.

9 So, are we at a point where you can break up
10 and talk to those experts and get your questions
11 answered?

12 FROM THE FLOOR: I have one question.

13 You have all these sites already developed,
14 and you are going to start breaking ground on green
15 sites. And tell me if I'm wrong, but a green site is
16 what I would consider a piece of land that's not been
17 developed?

18 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: That's right.
19 That's how I'm using the term. It's an area that
20 right now is habitat for wildlife. It hasn't been
21 developed, and this would require the removal of a
22 habitat.

23 FROM THE FLOOR: Why can't you develop or
24 redevelop some of your areas in -- that have already
25 been?

1 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: That is an excellent
2 question, and probably would be one of the
3 alternatives that would be looked at would be
4 constructing facilities in several different
5 locations. These are all conceptual. The projects I
6 have listed out in our Notice of Intent and here today
7 are conceptual. There's nothing set in concrete. We
8 haven't fleshed them out well. They are little-bitty
9 teeny-tiny fruits, and they may not get ripe. They
10 may not become real projects since they are so early
11 in the process. We're looking at over a five-year
12 window, and it's hard to see that far into the
13 future. So these are conceptual projects we have
14 identified as possible projects. And so, we haven't
15 fleshed out the project, much less alternatives and so
16 forth.

17 FROM THE FLOOR: Well, where would I go on a
18 website to look to help support non -- non-expansion,
19 not -- not going to green sites, not developing more
20 radioactive sites and just maintaining ones that are
21 already there, without hurting the environment any
22 more?

23 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: I don't know
24 specifically a website location, but certainly that's
25 a comment that we would like to hear from you. If you

1 would please submit a comment to that effect into the
2 record.

3 FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. Just --

4 MS. DEBORAH HALL: But more specifically,
5 again, it will come from a general person. So if you
6 want to say this again, don't feel shy about that.

7 And I think there's one more question before
8 we break.

9 FROM THE FLOOR: Yes, along the same lines.
10 You have mentioned that there is an endangered
11 species, and I wondered what they were?

12 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: We have several
13 different possible endangered species in various
14 different locations across LANL. In that general
15 vicinity is the Mexican spotted owl.

16 FROM THE FLOOR: And you also mentioned a
17 transfer of waste early on in the talking. Where were
18 you planning to transfer it?

19 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: That would be an
20 issue that we would develop as we develop the
21 analysis, what kind of waste we have, what our options
22 for dealing with various different wastes that are
23 produced, especially with the demolition of the
24 facilities.

25 FROM THE FLOOR: And is there a -- people

1 addressing the issue of the Mexican -- New Mexican
2 spotted owl at LANL in terms of the protection of it?

3 MS. ELIZABETH WITHERS: Yes. We have a
4 threatened and endangered species habitat management
5 plan that we developed for LANL back in the mid 1990s
6 and that is still in effect at the Laboratory. We
7 take the spotted owls and other threatened and
8 endangered species very seriously there. And we do
9 have a plan to help protect them. Some of the folks
10 over -- and Leslie Hanson, you want to raise your
11 hand? She may be able to take direct questions about
12 the threatened and endangered species.

13 MS. DEBORAH HALL: Okay. Let's break to the
14 tables, court reporter table, flip charts, and other
15 comments directly to any of the LANL staff, to
16 Elizabeth, and anyone in the room. So -- thank you
17 very much.

18 (The session having concluded, the following
19 are individual comments recorded at the
20 court reporter's table.)

21 MS. PENELOPE McMULLEN: First, I want to
22 say, I want to put into the record an objection to the
23 process. That the notice that I got said oral
24 statements, which to me means I get to speak to the
25 group here. And I wanted people here to hear what I

1 had to say and not have to go around to this person
2 and the next person and the next person, et cetera.
3 Okay.

4 It feels like since -- we have brought this
5 up before -- that there is a deliberate attempt not to
6 have the people who work at Los Alamos hear what we
7 have to say. That's what it feels like. And if they
8 don't want to us feel that, then please honor our
9 request to be able to speak, especially when there's
10 not a lot of us and we have short statements.

11 Then another comment I want to leave tonight
12 which is what I wanted to say to everyone, I will be
13 submitting more technical written comments later, but
14 what I wanted people to hear has to do with President
15 Bush believing that he has a mandate to uphold
16 morality. So the Loreto Community, which consists of
17 Catholic sisters and co-members, has been working for
18 nuclear disarmament since 1978, "as an urgent moral
19 imperative." The Vatican has declared that
20 development of weapons of mass destruction "deserve
21 condemnation." So the Loreto Community requests a
22 full new SWEIS to change LANL's mission from
23 developing weapons of mass destruction to really
24 working for nonproliferation, which includes our
25 country as well as other countries.

1 Okay, thank you.

2 MR. JEFFREY BIRNBAUM: My question was, why
3 is there a need for expansion of current sites into
4 green areas? Why can't there be redevelopment in the
5 current zones that have -- that there is -- there can
6 be -- where redevelopment can be done as opposed to
7 going in and destroying natural sites with more
8 radioactive material?

9 (The meeting concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss
2 COUNTY OF SANTA FE)

3

4 C E R T I F I C A T E

5 I, MABEL JIN CHIN, New Mexico Certified Court
Reporter, do hereby certify that I did report in
6 stenographic shorthand the proceedings set forth
herein, and the foregoing is a true and correct
7 transcription of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither employed by
8 nor related to any of the parties or attorneys in this
case, and that I have no interest whatsoever in the
9 final disposition of this case in any court.

10

11 Mabel Jin Chin, CCR
Certified Court Reporter #81
12 License Expires: 12/31/05

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 (6701R) MC